

- 7 -

REMARKS

Pursuant to our telephone interview of July 3, 2003, the applicants propose amending the claims as suggested in the interview. If the claims are not acceptable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss exact wording for the claims.

Specifically, claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled. Claim 3, which the Examiner expressed a willingness to allow, has been placed in independent form and claims 4-5 now depend from it. Claim 6 has been amended to paraphrase the language of page 2, lines 20-28 more precisely. Claim 7 depends from claim 6. The applicants propose cancelling claim 8 and placing claim 10 which the Examiner expressed a willingness to allow, in independent form. Claim 9 will depend from claim 10.

The applicants propose to cancel claim 11.

Although not discussed in the telephone interview, the applicants need apparatus protection at least of a scope comparable to claim 6. To this end, the applicants propose amending claim 12, which was in many respects the narrowest, to parallel method claim 6 more closely and to address other points noted in the Advisory Action.

The applicants are also submitting proposed amendments to the paragraph which spans lines 20-28 of page 2 as discussed in the telephone interview.

The applicants would like to resolve the outstanding issues by the July 11, 2003 due date for responding. The applicants would appreciate an early telephone call from the Examiner to indicate this amendment places the application in condition for allowance or to discuss and finalize the claim language.